

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 30 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 11 and 21 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over WO00/44115 (Alaimo). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention with greater clarity. In view of these clarifications, withdrawal of the art rejection is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 defines a bus framer that includes an engine which extracts information from a frame of data being transmitted over a time-division multiplexed bus and a processor which receives the information from the engine over an internal bus and forwards the information. The frame of data comprises a data structure having blocks arranged in N rows and M columns, where N and M are integers that are greater than one, and where a block includes data used to implement a bus frame protocol and designates a destination port of a receiving device and a time slot for the data.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to extracting information from a frame of data having blocks arranged in N rows and M columns, where N and M are integers that are greater than one, and where a block includes data used to implement a bus frame protocol and designates a destination port of a receiving device and a time slot for the data.

More specifically, Alaimo describes a quad framer having quad cards that receive DS1 data from T-1 lines and that frame the data in a "generally conventional manner" (see, e.g., page 10, lines 7 and 8 of Alaimo). It was said on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, that page 15 of

Alaimo describes "a data structure having N rows and M columns, where N and M are greater than one, a block corresponding to a destination port and a time slot for the data". Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Alaimo. That is, as understood by Applicants, the data structures described on page 15 of Alaimo relate to the hardware configuration of the quad cards, not to data framed by the quad cards. This data constitutes data stored in registers of the quad cards, such as the card identification (ID), the card type, and LED controls associated with the card. It is clearly not framed data.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, even if the data structures on page 15 could somehow be equated to the frames of claim 1, Alaimo would still differ from the invention of claim 1 in that the alleged "frames" of Alaimo do not contain data used to implement a bus frame protocol, and do not designate a destination port of a receiving device or a time slot for the data, as required by claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Amended independent claims 11 and 21 are method and article of manufacture claims, respectively, that roughly correspond to claim 1. These claims are also believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims enjoy the novelty of their parent claims and, although it is believed that each dependent claim defines a separate patentable feature, for this reason the dependent claims are not discussed here in detail.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above

Applicants : Jesus Palamino Echartea, et al.
Serial No. : 10/032,743
Filed : October 25, 2001
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-623001
Intel Docket No.: P12874

may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

No fees are believed to be due for this amendment, however, if any fees are due, please charge them to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-623001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

June 22, 2004



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906